

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Facilitating contemporary music in projects in schools – a qualitative study in Germany

Julia Wieneke

University of Music and Performing Arts Graz Leonhardstr. 82-84, 8010 Graz, Austria
Corresponding author. Email: Julia.wieneke@kug.ac.at

Abstract

Since the late nineties, composition projects inviting artists and contemporary composers into schools and communities became more established and written about in German speaking countries (see for instance Henze, 1998; Schneider, Bösze & Stangl, 2000; Schneider, 2000; Schatt, 2009; Schlothfeldt, 2009; Schneider, 2012). Additionally, music education researchers have provided theoretical and didactical analysis of contemporary music teaching and learning in schools (Winkler, 2002; Weber, 2003). In this qualitative study, expert interviews were analysed using Grounded Theory Methodology to investigate structures and processes of current practises in collaborative composition projects. Apart from illustrating the seven structural factors and three main project sections that emerged, the article also discusses the main category *fostering creative processes*.

Keywords: contemporary composition projects; collaboration; structures; creative processes; GTM

The German school system has undergone massive changes since 2000, one of them being the widespread introduction of all-day¹ schools in primary and secondary education across the country. This enabled, amongst other things, more opportunities for collaborations with community institutions, such as music schools, orchestras and ensembles as well as freelance musicians and artists. Inspired by British programmes, individual collaborations had been formed in larger cities between schools, artists and orchestras. In 2003, when Sir Simon Rattle engaged choreographer Royston Maldoom for the project ‘Rhythm is it’, the accompanying TV documentary was widely acknowledged (Grube & Lansch, 2005). This turned out to be a milestone for these types of collaborations and various other ensembles followed up with similar programmes and projects. With respect to contemporary music on the other hand, although not as much in the spotlight, there had already been several initiatives towards projects with composers, musicians and schools in German-speaking countries – one of the most elaborate being ‘Klangnetze’ in Austria (Schneider, Bösze & Stangl, 2000; Schneider, 2000). Apart from ‘Klangnetze’, these projects were at first centred on a reference composition, a work by a contemporary composer that was presented to the pupils and transformed into some kind of composition by the young people. They were assisted by either a musician or a composer during the work and the resulting compositions were often performed in a public concert alongside a performance of the reference composition.

Contemporary music projects as a study object

In contrast to British music education, these projects were not easily implemented in lesson plans, since ‘composing’ as such was not – and often is still not – a required competence included into the curriculum. This can be traced back to the notion that ‘composing’ music was strongly associated to mastery emphasising prevailing reservations towards pupils’ creative possibilities.

Consequently, this led to the avoidance of the word ‘composition’ for musical productions and actions in the classroom altogether, which were alternatively labelled as ‘musical inventions’, ‘explorations’, ‘discoveries’, ‘sound experiments’, ‘realisations’ or ‘creations’ (Eckardt, 1995; Nimczik, 1997; Schmitt, 1997; Wallbaum, 2000). Moreover, these perceptions were promoted by prominent musicologists such as Carl Dahlhaus, who in 1979 suggested a working definition assigning five qualities to ‘compositions’: They had to be self-contained, elaborated, notated in writing, performed and the elaborated and notated parts had to be vital for the aesthetic consciousness of the listener (Dahlhaus, 1979).² However, it should be noted that most contemporary composers, musicians, as well as many educators nowadays favour far less rigid definitions for ‘composition’ than those given by Dahlhaus (Meyer 2011). One could even argue that today none of these assigned qualities are valid anymore. Nevertheless, these conservative, and in certain ways, elitist stances also had a great impact on the curriculum in teacher education, and as a result contemporary music and composing with children were not included as compulsory content. Therefore, many music teachers – up to this day – are reluctant to incorporate creative explorations with their pupils, and are rather hesitant to embrace contemporary music in their curriculum altogether.

In spite of these unfavourable conditions, some teachers did show interest in working with musicians/composers in their classrooms and were willing to bring pupils into contact with contemporary (classical) music. Because of the specific situation in Germany, where all states have sovereignty to a great extent over the structures and content of formal education, such composition projects and collaborations evolved without formative or summative evaluation of quality and learning outcomes over a long period. Thus, this qualitative study was designed to enable an in-depth view into the characteristic structures and processes of contemporary music projects in German schools (Wieneke, 2016). The study aimed firstly to investigate, whether generalised descriptions of different types of projects can be provided, and secondly to describe facilitators’ experiences with these various forms, revealing favourable structures that deepen creative processes in the classroom. The research questions included the inquiry of project structures to allow for comparison and potential indications to enhance quality. Additionally, processes during the workshop phases and their possible links to pupils’ increased or stunted creative involvement were investigated. Furthermore, learning outcomes for all participants and necessary competences for facilitators (teachers and musicians/composers) were also explored. The last questions dealt with features the experts identified as enhancing or, in reverse, diminishing the quality of the educational artistic projects. This article focuses on the structures and processes of typical projects, providing some additional insight into the facilitation of creative processes.

Research design and methods

The study consisted of nine guided interviews with experts from different backgrounds in musical professions, who had been identified as having long-standing experiences with contemporary music projects. Additionally, a group interview with freelance musicians/composers was conducted during their self-organised yearly retreat. The experts either identified as musicians, composers, music teachers or university professors in teacher education, they came from all parts of Germany, and males and females were equally represented. All of them had extensive practical knowledge; furthermore, reflective competence also played a great part in the selection. Interviewees purposely came from differing backgrounds and had participated in or organised a wide variety of projects, in order to make the comparison between different forms and structures more significant. Every participant, except for the group interviewees, agreed to be cited with their full name. By choosing experts from different areas, it was ensured that they had not worked within the same contexts – in case of the university professors, this condition led to the decision to invite a third expert, Peter W. Schatt, as it became clear in the analysis that both Hans Schneider and Ursula

Brandstätter had made influential encounters with contemporary music projects via the above-mentioned 'Klangnetze'. All interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim prior to the detailed analysis utilising the software programme MAXQDA. Grounded Theory Methodology (GTM) was chosen as the most suitable research paradigm for this qualitative study, where subject, methods and theories should enable the inclusion of different perspectives as well as the reflection of the researcher on the research itself as a part of the process (Flick, 2007). In order to adapt to the area of interest, GTM does not constitute a standardised theory but it can rather be explained as a flexible and adjustable research strategy with diverse elements (Mey & Mruck, 2007). Here, Strauss and Corbin's coding paradigm was used and adapted to the emerging categories for structures and processes that were reported by the experts (Strauss & Corbin, 1996). The interviews were analysed in depth by attributing open codes and 'in-vivo' codes to all remarks. All sentences were read out aloud in this phase and fitting names for the codes were either taken from the interviews themselves ('in-vivo') or developed by the researcher (open codes). After the first complete analysis of all interviews, the codes were organised and grouped into axial codes. Three different types of codes were attributed: factual codes, thematic codes and evaluative codes (Kuckartz, 2010). In the third stage of analysis, selective coding allowed condensing the number of categories until a main category remained. Extensive memos were written during the whole process, and their increasing conceptual level guided the interpretation of the data. Additionally, all experts were asked for feedback at several stages of the study, whereby they had the opportunity to approve of the attributed codes and categories to their own statements.

Structures of contemporary music projects

During the coding process, seven factors emerged that apparently had a great influence on the structures and general framework: *cooperation, organisational structure, funding, public sphere, metacommunication, team(-building) and time*. Most of the interviewees reported of several *cooperating institutions* related to the projects, ranging from festivals and promoters, opera houses and orchestras, universities, contemporary music associations, different music societies, freelance musicians and composers to primary and secondary schools. These collaborations provide the basis of the projects, thereby directly affecting other areas, such as funding and *organisational structure*. The latter, as reported by the interview partners, differs according to the scope and size of the projects. In larger initiatives with several partners, administrative tasks can be distributed to orchestra offices or university bureaux, which consequently relieves musicians/composers, and enables them to focus more on the conceptualisation of content and allows for devoting more time towards actual creative work. *Funding* of these school projects is a central structural aspect in the interviews, as permanent and reliable sponsorship in the public sector is, on the whole, non-existent. Hence, sponsoring has to be acquired from various institutions, such as private enterprises, banks, federal or local agencies or even through parents' initiatives.³ This means that new proposals have to be written and adapted for each project. Connections to the *public sphere* are visible at differing levels, either through school concerts or open rehearsals, where other members of the school community can relate to the projects, or for a wider audience, through presentations as part of public concerts in larger venues, such as opera houses, concert halls, city centres or festival venues. An exceptional role for the public sphere was reported from a project by Astrid Schmeling during which pupils were encouraged to dedicate a piece of music to a chosen spot in their home town. These pieces of music were then played at those specific locations with the audience walking the distances from one place to the next. Some interviewees report of preset dates for *metacommunications (milestones)* between all participating partners during the course of the events. These opportunities for reflection are built in in order to communicate during the process, to talk about organisational details, estimated outcomes, progressions and occurring problems, but they can also function as a means of evaluation at the end. Especially in projects

including university partners, these milestones seem to be firmly integrated, explained by the necessity to supervise the students in their experiences as part of the teams in schools. Also, all interviewed university professors stress the fact that reflection is a key element of the professional development. For smaller projects or those involving school teachers, this reflection occurs in informal settings and on a 'bilateral level', as the teacher Silke Egeler-Wittmann put it.

Team and team building are also important topics in the interviews, as with more elaborate collaborations involving several partners, the process of team building receives a substantial amount of attention. Participants in these settings mostly get the chance to pick their partners during the first meeting; hence, sympathy, aesthetic preference and/or availability prevail. In other cases, a given 'pool' of possible partners serves as a basis to choose from. Because the school teachers among the participants mostly organise their own projects, they, of course, decide individually which musicians/composers they would like to work with. The last structural aspect that evolved during the data analysis is that of appointed *time*. Most interviewees report about 10 sessions of 90 min duration each over a period of 3 to 6 months, as part of the actual classroom work. This is reasoned by Ursula Brandstätter and Hans Schneider as a sufficient amount of time to work in depth on a topic. However, such conditions also stress the necessity to stay focused because of the defined allocation of time.

By comparing and systemising the information provided by the interviewees, it was possible to identify the characteristic features of specific types of contemporary music projects:

Type I projects are individual projects, with a length of up to twenty 90-min sessions, organised by one person (musician/composer or teacher), and without a supporting infrastructure. There are neither milestone meetings, nor is there a complementary team building process. Everything is decided by personal preferences and acquaintances, and the creative outcome is generally presented in public. Nevertheless, larger cooperation can develop as a result of the project.

Type IIa projects comprise of those with more than one partner. The organisation is managed by an external or internal bureau and there is a public presentation at the end. The length of these projects can reach from only 3 sessions to up to 20, depending on the sponsor and the organising institution. For the most part the team building process is realised with organisational, artistic and personal perspectives in mind, but milestone meetings are not included in all of these collaborations.

Type IIb projects also consist of larger partnerships, but they include universities as partners, and therefore have an additional educational viewpoint. This means they all schedule milestone meetings for all project partners before, during and after the venture. Generally, a minimum length of ten 90-min sessions is reserved for the creative work in the classroom.

Processes in contemporary music projects

The interviews provided valuable insight into various creative processes during these music projects (Pope, 2005). The emerging stages appeared very similar to those of the 'project-method' as described by Karl Frey (2007). Three main sections could be distinguished: *Development Stage*, *Realisation Phase* and *Closure*. Each of these three stages consists of several smaller segments, whilst not all of them appear necessarily in all of the accounts. In some of the smaller projects, team building aspects or the decision for a specific group of pupils are superfluous; consequently, the development phase is rather compressed. Shared reflections in 'milestone meetings' or evaluation processes are also absent in certain cases.

The *Development Stage* stands at the beginning of a creative enterprise and consists of three distinct subsegments. The first is the start of the project initiative and the decision for a specific theme. The initiative is either started by the teachers/musicians/composers themselves, or they are invited and recruited by other institutions. Oftentimes, even larger collaborations are instigated by individuals, as was reported for instance by Ursula Brandstätter. Previous experiences

with other types of contemporary music projects can greatly impact on the commitment for a new venture. In this first phase, the constellation within the leadership team is of great importance. If the individuals involved work well together on a professional as well as on a personal level, the good atmosphere can contribute greatly to the progress of the initiatives. The decision for a specific theme is often stipulated by call for entries from competitions or by invitations to festivals under a preset guideline. The topics can be extramusical: an example given by Silke Egeler-Wittmann was 'Plenarmusik', where the routines of the parliament were transformed into a music theatre piece. Themes can also arise from particular reference compositions which the interviewees labelled as 'Response'-type projects. Limitations can also take the form of a specific kind of compositional mode, such as 'experimental', or it can be inspired by situational preconditions such as mottos of adjacent festivals. Only a few initiatives choose to work without setting boundaries or themes prior to the start of the realisation stage. Bernhard Rissmann reports that he likes to work with the energy of the class and find out 'what is alive inside the classroom'. The majority of the experts, however, reported the prior limitation of themes as positive and beneficial for the creative work in the classroom. Beyond these considerations, the first segment of the Development Stage also includes acquiring financial funding and securing sponsors as well as liaising with project partners concerning the administrative, personnel and timed proceedings. The focus of the second subsegment is the selection of participants. Teachers and their classes can apply in several ways: on occasions announcements are made through school administration, through websites or by personal acquaintance. The experts report that often teachers approach the institutions because they want to take part in the projects (again). Ursula Brandstätter explained that the project 'Querklang' tried to achieve a good mix of teachers and musicians/composers who participate for the first time, versus those who have already taken part. In smaller ventures, teachers choose their artistic partners according to aesthetic principles, as Silke Egeler-Wittmann recounted her own approach. In certain cases, classes are deliberately chosen because of musical background, or if particular age groups are preferred. In others cases, due to public funding, a selection panel takes care that all kinds of schools are included to ensure diversity. In type IIb projects (university projects), participating students major either in composition or in general music education, occasionally even with a focus on contemporary music.

The third subsegment of the Development Stage is the preparation of the teams for work in the classroom. Especially the type IIb projects stood out as notably elaborate in this regard: at 'Querklang', all members attended a four-day residential led by university teachers. On this occasion, they got to know each other on a personal, musical and pedagogical level; teams were built and first ideas for the classroom were explored. Peter W. Schatt likewise mentioned a seminar for all participants before the start of a project for coordination purposes and to form a pedagogical basis (Schatt, 2009). Hans Schneider described the half-day courses aimed at artistic and pedagogical training for the participating students, as well as additional meetings with the entire staff. Preceding workshops were reported in several other interviews as well, these were intended to prepare teachers, the musicians/composers – and sometimes even the parents. These workshops served not only to prepare participants for the actual creative phase in the classroom, but also to determine what should happen in class during the realisation stage. Furthermore, teams are formed (or in rare cases brought together) during these preliminary meetings. As Hans Schneider emphasised, the leadership should observe these team building processes closely, so that mismatches can be identified and responded to accordingly already at an early stage. In one case, the first meeting simultaneously served as a press conference and this circumstance turned out to be cumbersome to an unimpeded and intense acquaintance among the participants. In the present study, the various types of 'milestone meetings' situated on a meta level were assigned to the Development Stage, as they often start during the development phase and then accompany the subsequent classroom sessions at given times in the form of 'in-between contemplations' or 'round tables'. There are some other types of meta-level

action: in some of the larger projects, mostly those of type IIb, project leaders organised dates for a school visit with each of the teacher–artist duos. Furthermore, almost all experts recounted the importance of joined lesson planning and lesson reflection in the teacher–artist duos as a method of ‘pausing to think’ about the already accomplished and the prospects for the next lessons.

The *Realisation Phase* combines all of the work inside the classroom, and can be subdivided into four different segments namely; (1) an introductory episode, (2) collection and production of musical material, (3) structuring and a selection of suitable motifs, (4) revision and practise. After an introductory episode, the experts recurrently mentioned some type of collection and production of musical material. This segment is usually followed by a period of structuring and a selection of suitable motifs, and finally by a phase of revision and practise. In practise, these phases often overlap and repeat in a spiral-shaped progress. The first segment serves several purposes: on the one hand, the introduction is the first encounter of all parties in the classroom whereby the relationship between the musician/composer and the pupils is established. Generally, a generous amount of time is allotted for an introduction of the artist (together with his or her instrument) and of the pupils themselves, in order to facilitate a personal exchange about ideas and concepts of music and composition. On the other hand, this first meeting helps to build a personal connection between the participants, an aspect that is referred to by the experts as crucial for the progression of the whole project. The introduction, therefore, enables an artistic musical, as well as personal relationship, providing an essential foundation for the following collaboration. Musical games and exercises, playful handling of instruments and/or materials are described among the means to foster interaction within the group during these first lessons, aimed at sparking pupils’ motivation and sustained interest for the undertaking in general. Hans Schneider attributes great importance to this beginning phase: for him, the first 90 min have to win the children over. They should experience immediate successes and see some first, exciting results that impress them and so arouse their curiosity for the events to come. To accomplish that, the starting lesson has to be well constructed and thought through, with an appropriate level of energy and learning tempo. In addition, introducing the theme of the project (if existing) usually is a part of this very early stage, be it in a rather playful way, through the compilation of spontaneous ideas, or in a more intellectual manner. During the next segment of the classroom work, the collection and production of musical material(s), pupils are expected to become proficient on their musical instruments and with the sounds needed. The rather generalised tasks of the introductory phase are revisited on a more elaborate level and musical experiments are conducted to discover possible answers to the arising musical questions. Characteristically, lesson settings open up at this stage towards more pupil-oriented structures, where the team of instructors only functions as facilitators of the pupils’ self-directed creative processes (Rolle, 1999). Pupils learn to experiment with their own aesthetic ideas autonomously, mostly whilst working in small groups; the musicians/composers offer advice and suggestions only when, and as much as, needed. The third segment of the Realisation Phase is dedicated to selecting and structuring the assembled musical materials. This phase is predominantly guided by the musicians/composers, whose competences are required when it comes to choosing and revising the most interesting musical ideas and actions. This process of final editing needs to be deliberate and articulate, as careful conveyance and discussion of reasons for the selection of sounds and actions with the pupils are of great importance. With regard to the final musical outcome, the musicians/composers should have the competence to construct the final version of the piece in an appropriate and aesthetically satisfying form. Sometimes this may include reducing or intensifying the pupils’ materials, and sometimes this may entail revisiting the collection and production phase. In the Realisation Phase’s last segment, adjustments and rehearsals dominate the work in the classroom and this continues characteristically until the final presentation. Pupils are often unfamiliar with this kind of organised and structured practising, so they can benefit greatly from the musicians’/composers’ expert knowledge during this stage. The interviewees described that they generally include practising ‘behaviour on a stage, walking on and

off the stage and curtain calls', so that pupils can develop necessary routines for the actual presentations.

During the *Closure* of the projects, pupils at first get the chance to present their composition to the school public, be it in a school concert or on a smaller scale, for instance, to the neighbouring form. Additionally, they usually perform their piece in a public concert, sometimes as part of the main programme, sometimes as an opening act or in the run-up to an evening performance. The Closure is of great relevance, not only because the group has to perform and to prove themselves, but also because they often get the chance to listen to pieces produced by other groups. After the actual performances, experts report differing forms of evaluations or reflections: in some cases pupils write letters to the teams, in others standardized surveys and interviews are conducted (Schatt, 2009). Hans Schneider stresses the importance of one last meeting with everyone involved, in order to gather feedback from the pupils, but also as a chance for the musicians/composers to convey their impressions about the work processes. This reflection is considered an important part of the third phase, where professional learning can be promoted.

How can pupils' creative processes be facilitated?

Fostering Creative Processes through specific modes turned out to be the most important imperative in the compositional projects. The first mode includes the differing approaches the teams take at the introductory episode of the project: the first can be described as reference composition-oriented, the second as centred on extramusical themes and the third as experimental. In 'Response'-type projects (reference composition-oriented), teams generally extract apt elements of the given work and adjust them during the Development Stage to enable and foster pupils' experiences with the music in a playful way. These elements may not be inherently musical, but rather are certain overarching topics that help pupils to find a starting point for their creative work. They are usually pivotal for the composition and provide a basis for exercises and games in the classroom. Silke Egeler-Wittmann offers a few examples: typical crescendo progressions, clusters, instrumentation or sound shifts. In one project, older and musically more proficient pupils were actively involved in the preparation phase: before the actual project took place, they listened to the piece, marked their favourite passages and attempted to analyse formal structures with the score at hand. Then they started to work on their own composition with the chosen materials and structures (Schatt, 2009). The second mode works with various extramusical themes, which are mostly predefined topics, such as 'time and movement' or 'music and ritual'. These are adapted by the teams in the Development Stage and sometimes this extends to further research together with the pupils during the Realisation Phase (for example, in form of interviews, sound collections or visits to external sites etc.). These strategies help to structure and plan actions before actually starting to play and make music, which some of the experts prefer, by far. To them, this keeps the pupils from 'fingering and playing around with instruments and objects and conceding early on to stereotyped modes of expression' (Matthias Handschick). The third mode can be labelled as experimental with the main feature of an open attitude towards ideas, formats and outcomes. In these types of projects, experimentation and improvisation play a major role, even if in some cases a circumscribed 'musical problem' forms the basis for the workshops, such as 'overtone world' or the 'decay of western musical culture' (group interview). These types of projects are realised generally with more experienced and musically competent pupils, as they have to be able to develop the musical materials autonomously. Naturally, greater freedom necessarily requires more prior knowledge. Some projects work towards the concept of a more experimental music, where the musicians'/composers' personalities and their aesthetic backgrounds are leading the projects in a specific direction and no other qualifications need to be fulfilled. 'Querklang' is a prototypical example for the experimental mode, because the diversity in the selection of the workshop leaders – from Chinese sheng player to computer music composer – has led to a great variety

of outcomes. In addition to these more general approaches that mostly apply to the introductory episode, several other modes can be specified that serve the promotion of creative processes, but are interspersed throughout the course of events.

The majority of interviewees stress the importance of games and exercises for the initiation of creative processes: 'Warm ups' are considered especially beneficial to intensify communication in the group; they enable a relaxed atmosphere and encourage the pupils to think outside the box and develop seemingly 'weird' ideas, so they can let go of preconceived aesthetic concepts. Some experts explicitly mentioned exercises incorporating movement; others talked at length about the importance of listening exercises (in form of 'listening minutes'). Some experts intentionally include tasks that help pupils to extend the (given) musical material; for instance, by not only playing regular flute sounds, but rather using creative techniques or unconventional sound production through physical or spatial means. However, some projects leaders report the opposite strategy by using deliberate limitations as a means to facilitate pupils' creativity. Such an approach is aligned with findings from psychological creativity research (Finke, 1990) and statements by music educators (Paynter & Aston, 1970). Experts also emphasise that the musical material itself needs to be, in some ways, antithetic, or that 'it should be prone to resistance' (Burkhard Friedrich), in order to set pupils' creative thinking in motion. These factors can help pupils to realise the underlying aesthetic problems or objectives and as the creative process evolves, this awareness influences the procedures of structuring and revising the composition. Some musicians/composers proceed in a more cognitive way, reflecting and thinking with the entire group about possibilities and further approaches; others start by working out of concrete musical action – both ways are considered to be potentially successful. Matthias Handschick states: 'I believe there are several types of creative processes. There are some that take place rather intellectually, by sitting around and thinking, until one discovers the manifold aspects of a problem or question one wants to deal with and with which one starts working. But the process can unfold completely different, by chance, experimentally, by simply doing something. It can be absolutely surprising.'⁴ This description corresponds to the different ways of fostering creativity in Siegfried Preiser's model (Preiser, 1976): he speaks of 'subconscious inspirations', or, on the different end of the spectrum, of 'rational pervasion', as starting points for creative processes. During the projects, it is therefore important to allow for enough time and space for pupils' improvisations, so they can test their aesthetic ideas and learn to question what they hear and play. Especially in these sensitive phases, the role of the musicians/composers is very important, because whilst they reflect on pupils' work and ideas, they can keep creative processes in flow by setting new tasks and by meticulously reacting to outcomes.

Discussion

The present study provides an in-depth insight into the prevalent structures and processes of contemporary music projects in collaborations involving musicians/composers and schools in Germany. Interviews with experts in different musical professions showed that the predominant feature of all cooperation is the enhancement of pupils' creative processes during the Realisation Phase of the projects. In order to achieve this objective from the Development Stage onwards, a good supporting structure is valuable, as it enables the musicians/composers and the music teacher teams to focus their efforts on musical content and teaching. Supportive project structures include meta-level activities, such as accompanying workshops, lesson visits or guided planning and reflection. During these activities, participants can exchange and compare experiences and negotiate and determine the next musical or pedagogical steps to take. This kind of professional development aspect is time- (and resource-) consuming, therefore it applies more frequently to larger collaborations including more than two partner institutions. Looking at the actual classroom action in the Realisation Phase, several modes can be discerned. These different modes affect

not only the various procedures during the introductory episodes, where musicians/composers and pupils first get acquainted, but they also have a great impact on the implemented games, musical actions and materials as well as on the compilation of pupils' creative work for the final composition. Although investigating project structures and processes through expert interviews provided a broad and deep insight into pedagogical, musical and organisational aspects of cooperation, this methodological decision entailed some limitations. During the first intensive field contacts, additional data sources were ruled out: the idea to analyse actual lesson processes via formalised observation was discarded, as this method appeared to be too intricate for a single researcher to process and interpret. Furthermore, the initial intention to conduct interviews with pupils during or after their workshop experiences did not fit into the emerging research aims. Because a sustainable impact on individual pupils' lives seems only marginal in many of the singular contemporary music projects with schools, it appeared unclear if their input and thoughts could contribute to the clarification of processes and structures. Nevertheless, future research into pupils' thoughts and experiences with contemporary music projects could definitely yield valuable additional insights, particularly by investigating and comparing experiences and perceptions of different groups of pupils (e.g., elementary school vs. sixth form; short-term projects vs. long-lasting collaborations; 'Response'-type projects vs. experimental approaches). Findings of the present study suggest that contemporary music projects in collaborations with teachers, musicians/composers and project leaders in schools encourage creative, musical and compositional expressions for pupils – if the structures and processes are prepared accordingly.

Notes.

1 Beforehand, German school days generally lasted from about 8:00 to approximately 13:00; the time expansion was partly due to the needs of working parents and an illustration of the schools' changing roles as partners in upbringing. Most all-day secondary schools now offer mandatory as well as extra-curricular activities until around 16:00.

2 '... Komposition (1) ein in sich geschlossenes, individuelles musikalisches Gebilde ist, welches (2) ausgearbeitet und (3) schriftlich fixiert ist, um (4) aufgeführt zu werden, wobei (5) das Ausgearbeitete und Notierte den essentiellen Teil des ästhetischen Gegenstandes ausmacht, der sich im Bewusstsein des Hörers konstituiert.'

3 These initiatives are common in German public schools. Parents become members through a yearly payment and the initiatives take up various projects as they arise, ranging from new playgrounds, and additional books, purchase of a new piano – whichever is needed.

4 'Ich glaube, es gibt ganz verschiedene Arten von kreativen Prozessen. Es gibt welche, die sich eher intellektuell vollziehen, dass man wirklich dasitzt, nachdenkt, und dann wartet, bis einem verschiedene Aspekte einer Problemstellung oder eines Themas einfallen, mit denen man sich beschäftigen will und mit denen man dann arbeitet. Der Prozess kann aber auch ganz anders verlaufen, zufällig, experimentell, dass man einfach mal etwas macht. Es kann total überraschend sein.'

References

- DAHLHAUS, C. (1979). Was heißt Improvisation? In R. Brinkmann (ed.), *Improvisation und neue Musik* (pp. 9–23). Mainz: Schott Verlag.
- ECKARDT, R. (1995). *Improvisation in der Musikdidaktik. Eine historiographische und systematische Untersuchung*. Augsburg: Wissner Verlag.
- FINKE, R. (1990). *Creative Imagery. Discoveries and Inventions in Visualization*. New York/London: Psychology Press.
- FLICK, U. (2007). *Qualitative Sozialforschung. Eine Einführung*. Reinbek: Rowohlt Taschenbuchverlag.
- FREY, K. (2007). *Die Projektmethode. Der Weg zum bildenden Tun*. Weinheim: Beltz Verlag.
- GRUBE, T. & LANSCH, E. S. (2005). *Rhythm Is It! You Can Change Your Life in a Dance Class*. Berlin: Boomtown Media Berlin (DVD).
- HENZE, H. W. (1998). *Komponieren in der Schule. Notizen aus einer Werkstatt*. Mainz: Schott Verlag.
- KUCKARTZ, U. (2010). *Einführung in die computergestützte Analyse qualitativer Daten*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- MEY, G. & MRUCK, K. (2007). *Grounded Theory Reader*. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- MEYER, A. (2011). *Was bleibt? 100 Jahre Neue Musik*. Mainz: Schott Verlag.
- NIMCZIK, O. (1997). Erfinden von Musik. In S.Helms, R.Schneider & R.Weber (eds.), *Handbuch des Musikunterrichts. Band 3 Sekundarstufe II* (pp. 169–189). Kassel: Bosse Verlag.

- PAYNTER, J. & ASTON, P. (1970). *Sound and Silence. Classroom Projects in Creative Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- POPE, R. (2005). *Creativity: Theory, History, Practice*. London: Routledge.
- PREISER, S. (1976). *Kreativitätsforschung*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- ROLLE, C. (1999). *Musikalisch-ästhetische Bildung. Über die Bedeutung ästhetischer Erfahrung für musikalische Bildungsprozesse*. Kassel: Bosse Verlag.
- SCHATT, P. W. (2009). *Unser Faust – meet the composer. Ein Kompositionsprojekt an Essener Schulen. Bericht – Evaluation – Dokumentation*. Regensburg: ConBrio Verlag.
- SCHLOTHFELDT, M. (2009). *Komponieren im Unterricht*. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag.
- SCHMITT, R. (1997). Musik erfinden. In S. Helms, R. Schneider & R. Weber (eds.), *Handbuch des Musikunterrichts. Band 1 Primarstufe* (pp. 187–236). Kassel: Bosse Verlag.
- SCHNEIDER, H. (2000). *Lose Anweisungen für klare Klangkonstellationen. Musiken und musikalische Phänomene des 20. Jahrhunderts: ihre Bedeutung für die Musikpädagogik*. Saarbrücken: Pfau Verlag.
- SCHNEIDER, H. (2012). *Neue Musik vermitteln. Ästhetische und methodische Fragestellungen*. Hildesheim: Olms.
- SCHNEIDER, H., BÖSZE, C. & STANGL, B. (2000). *Klangnetze. Ein Versuch, die Wirklichkeit mit den Ohren zu erfinden*. Saarbrücken: Pfau Verlag.
- STRAUSS, A. & CORBIN, J. (1996). *Grounded Theory: Grundlagen qualitativer Sozialforschung*. Weinheim: Beltz Verlag.
- WALLBAUM, C. (2000). *Produktionsdidaktik im Musikunterricht. Perspektiven zur Gestaltung ästhetischer Erfahrungssituationen*. Kassel: Bosse Verlag.
- WEBER, B. (2003). *Neue Musik und Vermittlung*. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag.
- WIENEKE, J. (2016). *Zeitgenössische Musik vermitteln in Kompositionsprojekten an Schulen*. Hildesheim: Olms Verlag.
- WINKLER, C. (2002). *Die Kunst der Stunde – Aktionsräume für Musik. Ein Modell zur Vermittlung von Musik aus systemisch-konstruktivistischer Sicht*. Augsburg: Wissner Verlag.